

No. 98-3051

Curt Bradbury, Individually and in his capacity as former Chairman/President of Worthen National Bank; Chip Dudley, Individually and in his capacity as President of Boatmen's National Bank of Arkansas in Little Rock, Arkansas; Gary Smith,

On Appeal from the United States
District Court for the
Eastern District of Arkansas.

[UNPUBLISHED]

Individually and in his capacity as *
Executive Vice President of Boatmen's *
National Bank of Little Rock, *
Arkansas; NationsBank, formerly *
known as Worthen National Bank of *
Arkansas, formerly known as *
Boatmen's National Bank of Arkansas, *
*
Appellees. *

Submitted: July 7, 1999
Filed: July 27, 1999

Before WOLLMAN, Chief Judge, BOWMAN, and BEAM, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Wardell Washington brought an action alleging defendants had misused a manuscript he had written and asserting claims of copyright and trademark infringement, unfair competition, unjust enrichment, “unauthorized duplication and distribution,” unfair and deceptive practices, malicious “stealing/taking and copying” of the manuscript, a RICO violation, and conspiracy. See Appellant's Brief at 1. The District Court¹ granted summary judgment for defendants, and denied Washington's motion for reconsideration. Washington appeals. He has filed a motion to supplement the record, which we grant.

After reviewing the District Court's grant of summary judgment de novo, see Thomas v. Gunter, 103 F.3d 700, 702 (8th Cir. 1997), we conclude that Washington's

¹The Honorable George Howard, Jr., United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

claims are unsupported, and that defendants were entitled to judgment as a matter of law. We also conclude the District Court did not abuse its discretion in denying further discovery before ruling on the summary judgment motion because the facts Washington sought to obtain would not have prevented the entry of summary judgment. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(f); Duffy v. Wolle, 123 F.3d 1026, 1040-41 (8th Cir. 1997), cert. denied, 118 S. Ct. 1839 (1998); Allen v. Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc., 81 F.3d 793, 797-98 (8th Cir. 1996). Finally, we conclude the District Court did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion for reconsideration. See Perkins v. US West Communications, 138 F.3d 336, 340 (8th Cir. 1998); Sanders v. Clemco Indus., 862 F.2d 161, 169 & n.14 (8th Cir. 1988).

As no error of law appears in the District Court's ruling, and we affirm for the reasons set forth in the District Court's decision, we believe that an extended opinion is unnecessary. Accordingly, we affirm without further discussion. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

A true copy.

Attest:

CLERK, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.